

**REMARKS**

**Summary of Office Action**

Claims 10-14, 17-23, and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Soenksen (US, 6,711,283).

Claims 15, 16, 24, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Birnbaum et al. (US, 5,923,821) in view of Dermer et al. (US, 5,313,570).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant respectfully traverses the assertions made by the Office at least for the following reasons.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Office Action, claims 10-14, 17-23, and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Soenksen. Claims 15, 16, 24, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Birnbaum et al. in view of Dermer et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and the Office Action's interpretation of the applied references for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claims 10, 19, and 28, as previously presented, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the prior art, whether taken singly or combined, teaches or suggests at least the features of independent claims 10, 19, and 28. Applicant respectfully submits that the filing date of Soenksen is May 3, 2000 and the filing date of the present application is November 30, 1999. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Soenksen can not be applied as a prior art, therefore Soenksen does not anticipate the features of pending

claims in the present application. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and claims 10-14, 17-23, and 26-28 be allowed. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Birnbaum et al. and Dermer et al. are not applied to reject independent claims 10, 19, and 28. Accordingly, since dependent claims 15, 16, 24, and 25 depend from respective one of allowable independent claims 10 and 19, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 15, 16, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

In light of the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because Soenksen does not anticipate the independent claims 10, 19, and 28, hence dependent claims 11-18 and 20-27. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 11-18 and 20-27 are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with regard to independent claims 10 and 19 upon which they respectfully depend, as well as the individual features they recite.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. : 046601-5034  
Application No.: 09/450,584  
Page 4

If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: Sumiko Onda  
Sumiko Onda  
Reg. No. L 0289

Dated: April 3, 2007

**CUSTOMER NO. 09629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 739-3000  
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001